UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/937,439	09/25/1997	MANABU FUKUSHIMA	500.30789R00	1798
20457 7590 02/17/2010 ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			EXAMINER	
			PAPPAS, PETER-ANTHONY	
SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	08/937,439	FUKUSHIMA ET AL.
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	PETER-ANTHONY PAPPAS	2628
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Per</u>	nding
(1) <u>PETER-ANTHONY PAPPAS</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Paul J. Skwierawski</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>14 December 2009</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1,14,26 Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	BDISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628	1	
(A _j	oplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner requested clarification on the claimed term "reference unit." The applicant clarified that the respective function performed by "display control section 105" and "priority display processing section 107," when considered in tandem, are the same as the function performed by said "reference unit." The applicant further clarified that said sections are within "CPU 201" and that "CPU 201" is considered to perform said functions performed by said "display control section 105" and said "priority display processing section 107."